



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,572	02/17/2004	Krzysztof Antoni Zaklika	197-001-USP	9281
45346 7590 10/02/2007 HENSLEY KIM & HOLZER, LLC 1660 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 3000 DENVER, CO 80264			EXAMINER DESIRE, GREGORY M	
			ART UNIT 2624	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/781,572

Applicant(s)

ZAKLIKA ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory M. Desire

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/12/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The USPTO "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" (Official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005), Annex IV, reads as follows:

While abstract ideas, natural phenomena, and laws of nature are not eligible for patenting, method and products employing abstract ideas, natural phenomena, and laws of nature to perform a real-world function may well be. In evaluating whether a claim meets the requirement of section 101, the claim must be considered as a whole to determine whether it is for a particular application of an abstract idea, natural phenomenon, or law of nature, rather than for the abstract idea, natural phenomenon, or law of nature itself.

For claims such excluded subject matter to be eligible, the claim must be for a practical application of the abstract idea, law of nature or natural phenomenon. Diehr, 450 U.S. at 187, 209 USPQ at 8 ("application of a law of nature or mathematical formula to a known structure or process may well be deserving of patent protection."); Benson, 409 U.S. at 71 175 USPQ at 676 (rejecting formula claim because it "has now substantial practical application").

To satisfy section 101 requirements, the claim must be for a practical application of the Sec. 101 judicial exception, which can be identified in various ways:

The claimed invention "transforms" an article or physical object to a different state or thing.

The claimed invention otherwise produces a useful, concrete and tangible result, based on the factors below.

2. Claims 1-50 recite the mere manipulation of data or an abstract idea, or merely solve a mathematical problem without a limitation to a practical application.

A practical application exists if the result, of the claimed invention is "useful, concrete and tangible" (with the emphasis on "result") (Guidelines, section IV.C.2.b). A "useful" result is one that satisfies the utility requirement of section 101, a "concrete"

Art Unit: 2624

result is one that is "repeatable" or "predictable", and a "tangible" result is one that is "real" or "real-world", as opposed to "abstract" (Guidelines, section IV. C.2.b). Claims 1-50 merely manipulates data without ever producing a useful, concrete and tangible result. Regarding independent claims 1 and 26, the claims merely samples pixels in first region, samples pixels in the second region and edit based on first and second distributions. Claims do not provide any result from the editing. Thus merely manipulating data without ever producing a useful, concrete and tangible result. Thus, practical application does not exist in the claims.

In order for the claimed method to produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result, recitation of one or more of the following elements is suggested:

- The manipulation of data that represents a physical object or activity transformed from outside the computer (MPEP 2106 IVB2 (b) (i)).
- A recitation of a physical transformation outside the method or apparatus, for example in the form of pre or post processing activity (MPEP 2106 IVB2 (b) (i)).
- A direct recitation of a practical application in the technological arts (MPEP 2106 IVB2 (b) (ii)).

Applicant is also advised to provide a written explanation of how and why the claimed invention (either as currently recited or as amended) produces a useful concrete and tangible result. Claims 2-25 and 27-50 depend on claims 1 and 26, respectively. Therefore are also rejected.

Art Unit: 2624

3. Claims 26-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter as follows.

The USPTO "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility" (Official Gazette notice of 22 November 2005), Annex IV, reads as follows:

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5<sup>th</sup> ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.

When function descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permit function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)(claim to data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency held statutory) and *Warmerdam*, 33 F. 3d at 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d at 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held product-by-process claim) with *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory).

In contrast, a claimed computer readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and function interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory, See *Lowry*, 32 F. 3d at 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d at 1035.

Claims 26-50 define computer program product encoding a computer program embodying functional descriptive material. However, the claims do not define a computer readable medium or memory and is thus non-statutory for that reason (i.e., "When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized: -Guidelines Annex IV). That is, the scope of the presently claimed computer program product can range from paper on which the program is written, to a program simply contemplated and memorized by a person. The examiner suggests amending the claim to acceptable language "computer-readable medium" encoded with

Art Unit: 2624

a computer program or equivalent in order to make the claim statutory. Any amendment to the claim should be commensurate with its corresponding disclosure.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gindele et al (2003/0179944).

Regarding claim 51 Gindele discloses,

A region sampling module (note fig. 2, 150) that samples pixels in a first region within a tool impression in a digital image to determine a first distribution of a pixel property of the pixels in the first region and samples pixels in a second region within the tool impression to determine a second distribution of the pixel property of the pixels in the second region (intended use, see MPEP 2114)

An editing module (note fig. 2, block 120) that edits at least one pixel within the tool impression based on the first and second distribution (intended use, see MPEP 2114)

Art Unit: 2624

**Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory M. Desire whose telephone number is (571) 272-7449. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen Lillis can be reached on (571) 272-6928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

G.D.  
September 27, 2007

  
GREGORY DESIRE  
REGISTERED EXAMINER